arXiv:1408.6624v2 [physics.chem-ph] 29 Nov 2014

Non-stochastic matrix Schrödinger equation for open systems

Loïc Joubert-Doriol,[1,2] Ilya G. Ryabinkin,[1,2] and Artur F. Izmaylov[1,2]
[1)] *Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences, University of Toronto Scarborough, Toronto, Ontario, M1C 1A4, Canada*
[2)] *Chemical Physics Theory Group, Department of Chemistry, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario M5S 3H6, Canada*

(Dated: 2 December 2014)

We propose an extension of the Schrödinger equation for a quantum system interacting with environment. This extension describes dynamics of a collection of auxiliary wave-functions organized as a matrix $\boldsymbol{m}$, from which the system density matrix can be reconstructed as $\hat{\rho} = \boldsymbol{m}\boldsymbol{m}^{\dagger}$. We formulate a compatibility condition, which ensures that the reconstructed density satisfies a given quantum master equation for the system density. The resulting non-stochastic evolution equation preserves positive-definiteness of the system density and is applicable to both Markovian and non-Markovian system-bath treatments. Our formalism also resolves a long-standing problem of energy loss in the time-dependent variational principle applied to mixed states of closed systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum evolution of a statistical mixture of quantum states is governed by the Liouville–von Neumann (LvN) equation $\dot{\hat{\rho}} = -i[\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}]$, where $\hat{H}$ is the Hamiltonian of a system and $\hat{\rho}$ is the corresponding density matrix (DM). The use of a DM in place of a Schrödinger wavefunction reflects a limited degree of knowledge about a quantum statistical mixture. The ability of a DM to describe statistical phenomena becomes essential in studies of an open quantum system interacting with its environment, since the exact quantum state of the environment is usually impossible to track or to control[1]. Dynamics of an open quantum system can be described by an appropriately modified LvN equation

$$\dot{\hat{\rho}} = -i[\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}] + \mathcal{N}[\hat{\rho}], \tag{1}$$

where a super-operator $\mathcal{N}$ describes non-unitary evolution of the system due to interaction with the environment and associated processes of relaxation, dissipation, and decoherence. We shall refer to Eq. (1) as the quantum master equation (QME). QME can be either postulated phenomenologically or derived from a microscopic Hamiltonian for the open system and its environment by integrating out environmental degrees of freedom (DOF)[1].

Despite its advantages, the DM-based formalism has a few problems. First, when a non-unitary part $\mathcal{N}$ of Eq. (1) is not a generator of a completely positive map, the DM may cease to be positively definite[2–4], which is deemed to be unphysical[5,6] (see also the debates in Refs. 7 and 8). In some particular cases, such as the Markovian dynamics, the positivity of the density matrix can be guaranteed by the Lindblad form[5] of $\mathcal{N}$. However, many approximations to $\mathcal{N}$, for example, all non-Markovian ones, cannot be derived in that form.

Second, the number of variables that are necessary to describe a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ by a DM as $\hat{\rho} = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is a quadratic function of the Hilbert space size $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}}$ for the $|\psi\rangle$ representation. One might expect then for a mixture of N states $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}} \times N$ variables at most are sufficient if an analog of a Schrödinger wavefunction would exist, whereas the DM formalism still depends on $\sim \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}}^2$ variables. Thus, if $N \ll \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}}$, the DM representation seems to be excessively expensive. The idea to decouple $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}}$ from N has well-defined physical grounds: $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is determined by accuracy requirements for each individual state, whereas the number of relevant states N in an ensemble is dictated by a relaxation process under consideration.

Finally, a further reduction of the Hilbert space size in quantum propagations can be achieved by using time-evolving basis functions. The time-dependent variational principle (TDVP) has been successfully used to obtain equations of motion for time-evolving basis functions in wavefunction-based frameworks[9–13]. Attempts to generalize the TDVP to the density formalism leads to dynamics that does not conserve the energy of an isolated mixed-state system.[14,15] Mathematical roots of this problem is in conservation of the $\mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}^2\hat{H}\}$ quantity by the density TDVP formulation instead of the system energy $E = \mathrm{Tr}\{\hat{\rho}\hat{H}\}$.

All these problems of the DM-based formalism prompted a search for an analog of the Schrödinger equation (SE) to describe statistical ensembles of states (mixed states). A handful of approaches of that spirit exist in the literature. Quantum state diffusion[16,17] and quantum jumps[18,19] methods are stochastic SE approaches which can describe both Markovian and non-Markovian dynamics via propagation of wavefunction realizations. However, the propagation is stochastic, and simulations must be converged in the number of stochastic trajectories. Another approach is propagation of a square-root of the density matrix[20]. This approach was developed only for the Lindblad type of QME[5], and even within the Lindblad scope the resulting equations of motion are not fully equivalent to the initial QME. Yet another alternative has been suggested through constructing an approximate, so-called surrogate Hamiltonian that contains system and selected environmental DOF.[21,22] Propagation of a surrogate Hamiltonian wave function allows one to obtain reduced system dynamics by trac-

ing out the environmental DOF.

In what follows we introduce a formalism that generalizes the SE to mixed states and open systems and addresses all aforementioned problems. Proposed non-stochastic equations of motion are completely equivalent to the solution of the corresponding QME provided that $\mathcal{N}[\hat{\rho}]$ is a generator of a complete positive mapping. The equations preserve the positive definiteness of the density matrix by construction, and hence, the method may be thought of as a regularization procedure for non-completely positive mappings. Therefore, our formalism provides a very general alternative to the Lindblad form that is suitable for both Markonvian and non-Markovian cases. We also naturally achieve the decoupling of the Hilbert space size $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}}$ from the number of states in an ensemble N. Finally, combining our approach with the TDVP, we restore the energy conservation for an *isolated* mixed state of an arbitrary system.

II. THEORY

We begin by considering the system and its environment as an isolated super-system described by a total wavefunction $|\Psi\rangle$. Introducing a complete set of individual states of the environment ("bath states") $\{|\Psi_{B,s}\rangle\}_{s=1}^{\infty}$, we expand the total wavefunction as

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_s |\psi_s\rangle\,|\Psi_{B,s}\rangle\,. \tag{2}$$

Coefficients $|\psi_s\rangle = \langle\Psi_{B,s}|\Psi\rangle_B$ are the functions of the system DOF because the integration is performed over the bath DOF only.

The reduced density matrix $\hat{\rho}$ of the system is obtained from the total density matrix $\hat{\rho}_{\rm tot} = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$ by tracing out the bath, $\hat{\rho} = {\rm Tr}_B\{\hat{\rho}_{\rm tot}\} = \sum_s |\psi_s\rangle\langle\psi_s|$. Assuming a basis set representation for $|\psi_s\rangle$, the reduced density can be presented in the matrix form

$$\hat{\rho} = \boldsymbol{m}\boldsymbol{m}^{\dagger}, \quad \boldsymbol{m} = \Big(|\psi_1\rangle \;\; |\psi_2\rangle \;\; \ldots\Big). \tag{3}$$

Thus, $\boldsymbol{m}$ is a matrix which can be thought of as a square root of $\hat{\rho}$. We will construct a non-stochastic open system Schrödinger equation (NOSSE) for the wavefunctions $\boldsymbol{m}$ in the following general form

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{m}} = -i\hat{H}\boldsymbol{m} + \mathcal{O}[\boldsymbol{m}], \tag{4}$$

where $\mathcal{O}[\boldsymbol{m}]$ is a functional of $\boldsymbol{m}$, which is responsible for relaxation, dissipation, and decoherence due to interaction with the environment. The central idea of this work is that the form of $\mathcal{O}[\boldsymbol{m}]$ can be obtained exactly from the expression for the non-unitary propagator $\mathcal{N}[\hat{\rho}]$ of the QME in Eq. (1). Introducing the density decomposition of Eq. (3) into the QME and demanding that Eq. (4) is satisfied, $\mathcal{O}[\boldsymbol{m}]$ is determined as a solution of the following equation:

$$\mathcal{O}[\boldsymbol{m}]\boldsymbol{m}^{\dagger} + \boldsymbol{m}\mathcal{O}[\boldsymbol{m}]^{\dagger} = \mathcal{N}[\boldsymbol{m}\boldsymbol{m}^{\dagger}]. \tag{5}$$

Multiplication of Eq. (5) by $\boldsymbol{m}^{\dagger}$ and $\boldsymbol{m}$ from left and right, respectively, leads to a $\star$-Sylvester equation[24]

$$\boldsymbol{m}^{\dagger}\mathcal{O}[\boldsymbol{m}]\left(\boldsymbol{m}^{\dagger}\boldsymbol{m}\right) + \left(\boldsymbol{m}^{\dagger}\boldsymbol{m}\right)\mathcal{O}[\boldsymbol{m}]^{\dagger}\boldsymbol{m} = \boldsymbol{m}^{\dagger}\mathcal{N}[\boldsymbol{m}\boldsymbol{m}^{\dagger}]\boldsymbol{m} \tag{6}$$

with $\boldsymbol{m}^{\dagger}\mathcal{O}[\boldsymbol{m}]$ and its Hermitian conjugate as the new unknowns. The solution of Eq. (6) exists if and only if the $\boldsymbol{m}^{\dagger}\boldsymbol{m}$ matrix is invertible[24]. To recover $\mathcal{O}[\boldsymbol{m}]$ from the solution of Eq. (6) one needs to compute $\boldsymbol{m}^{-1}$. The existence of $\boldsymbol{m}^{-1}$ guarantees positivity of all eigenvalues of the density $\hat{\rho}$.

Equations (4) and (5) constitute a set of coupled equations, whose solution is entirely equivalent to the solution of QME with a positive-defined density matrix $\hat{\rho}$. In many important cases one can bypass the numerical solution of Eq. (5) by obtaining the form of $\mathcal{O}[\boldsymbol{m}]$ through visual inspection. For example, if $\mathcal{N}[\hat{\rho}]$ is in the Lindblad form[5], $\mathcal{N}[\hat{\rho}] = \sum_j 2\hat{L}_j\hat{\rho}\hat{L}_j^{\dagger} - \hat{L}_j^{\dagger}\hat{L}_j\hat{\rho} - \hat{\rho}\hat{L}^{\dagger}\hat{L}_j$, then it is easy to check that $\mathcal{O}[\boldsymbol{m}] = \sum_j \hat{L}_j\boldsymbol{m}\,(\boldsymbol{m}^{-1}\hat{L}_j\boldsymbol{m})^{\dagger} - \hat{L}_j^{\dagger}\hat{L}_j\boldsymbol{m}$. Another example of the explicit solution of Eq. (5) is the time convolutionless master equation[1] considered as a numerical illustration below.

In fact, Eq. (5) admits a whole family of solutions. If $\mathcal{O}[\boldsymbol{m}]$ obeys Eq. (5) then $\mathcal{O}'[\boldsymbol{m}] = \mathcal{O}[\boldsymbol{m}] + i\boldsymbol{m}\boldsymbol{G}$ with a Hermitian matrix $\boldsymbol{G}$ also satisfies the same equation. $\boldsymbol{G}$ gives rise to phase dynamics that is insignificant for any observable properties. To show this, let us expand $\boldsymbol{m}$ in an orthonormal basis set as

$$\boldsymbol{m} = \boldsymbol{\varphi}^T\boldsymbol{A}, \tag{7}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\varphi}^T = (|\varphi_1\rangle \;\; |\varphi_2\rangle \;\; \ldots)$ is a vector of basis functions, and $\boldsymbol{A}$ is a matrix of coefficients. Introducing this expansion into Eq. (4) and considering for the simplicity a closed system ($\mathcal{N} \equiv 0$, $\mathcal{O}[\boldsymbol{m}] = i\boldsymbol{m}\boldsymbol{G}$), we obtain

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}^T\boldsymbol{A} + \boldsymbol{\varphi}^T\dot{\boldsymbol{A}} = -i\hat{H}\boldsymbol{\varphi}^T\boldsymbol{A} + i\boldsymbol{\varphi}^T\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{G}. \tag{8}$$

If we substitute $\boldsymbol{A}$ by $\boldsymbol{A}\exp(it\boldsymbol{G})$, then the last term in the right-hand side of Eq. (8) will be cancelled. The reduced density $\hat{\rho}$ assembled from $\boldsymbol{m}_G = \boldsymbol{\varphi}^T\boldsymbol{A}\exp(it\boldsymbol{G})$ by Eq. (3) does not depend on $\boldsymbol{G}$. Thus, the ambiguity in the solution of Eq. (5) is compensated by the phase transformation of $\boldsymbol{A}$ providing the $\boldsymbol{G}$-invariant formalism.

To solve Eq. (4) numerically, we specify $\boldsymbol{m}$ at $t = 0$ using the eigen-decomposition[25] of the initial density matrix:

$$\hat{\rho}(0) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \varpi_j\,|\varphi_j(0)\rangle\langle\varphi_j(0)|\,, \tag{9}$$

and assigning the components of $\boldsymbol{m}$ to be $|\psi_j\rangle = \sqrt{\varpi_j}\,|\varphi_j(0)\rangle$. In Eq. (9), N is the number of states in $\boldsymbol{m}$, and if each of $|\varphi_j(0)\rangle$ is described by a linear combination of $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}}$ Hilbert space vectors, then $\boldsymbol{m}(0)$ is a $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{H}} \times N$ rectangular matrix. The inverse of a rectangular $\boldsymbol{m}$ is understood as the pseudo-inverse[26]: $\boldsymbol{m}^{-1} = (\boldsymbol{m}^{\dagger}\boldsymbol{m})^{-1}\boldsymbol{m}^{\dagger}$,

so that the inversion is possible if and only if Eq. (6) admits a solution at time t (*i.e.* $\boldsymbol{m}^\dagger\boldsymbol{m}$ is invertible). In cases when it is expected that an energy flow from the environment will populate states $|\varphi_j\rangle$ that have small initial weights ϖ_j such states are added with numerically small weights to $\boldsymbol{m}(0)$. When N becomes larger than $(\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{H}+1)/2$, Eq. (5) appears to be overdetermined; this is yet another manifestation of a gauge degree of freedom associated with $\boldsymbol{G}$. However, Eq. (6) contains the right amount of information because the action of a rectangular $\boldsymbol{m}$ matrix from the left and the right reduces the dimensionality of the matrices to the correct values. Moreover, the freedom in the choice of $\boldsymbol{G}$ can be used to reduce the number of propagated variables in $\boldsymbol{m}$. If $\boldsymbol{A}$ at $t=0$ in Eq. (7) is brought to a lower triangular form by applying the Cholesky decomposition to $\hat\rho$ then N diagonal *real* and $N(N-1)/2$ off-diagonal *complex* matrix elements of $\boldsymbol{G}$ can be chosen to preserve this shape of $\boldsymbol{A}$ at any time. Thus, the number of coefficients to propagate is minimized to $N\left(\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{H}-\frac{N-1}{2}\right)$.

III. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

Our first example shows the NOSSE ability to recover the exact solution of the QME equation for non-adiabatic non-Markovian dynamics of an open system. We demonstrate that our approach allows for a flexible control of the numerical efforts needed to obtain converged results.

The model describes population transfer between two electronic states, donor and acceptor, which are interacting with a harmonic bath. The system is characterized by a two-dimensional linear vibronic coupling (LVC) Hamiltonian written in frequency- and mass-weighted coordinates

$$\hat H = \sum_{j=1}^{2}\frac{\omega_j}{2}\left(\hat p_j^2+\hat x_j^2\right)\mathbf{1}_2 + \left(\frac{\Delta}{2}-d\,\hat x_1\right)\boldsymbol{\sigma}_z + c\hat x_2\boldsymbol{\sigma}_x, \tag{10}$$

where $\mathbf{1}_2$ is the 2×2 unit matrix, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_x$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_z$ are the Pauli matrices. A discretized Ohmic spectral density bath of 100 harmonic oscillators with frequencies Ω_k is coupled linearly to the $\hat x_2$ coordinate with coupling strengths λ_k. Numerical values of all parameters as well as initial conditions are given in the supplemental material[27].

The QME is obtained using the time convolutionless approach up to the second order in the system-bath interaction[1]

$$\dot{\hat\rho} = -i\left[\hat H,\hat\rho\right] - \left(\left[\hat x_2,\hat x_2(t)\hat\rho\right] + \left[\hat\rho\hat x_2(t)^\dagger,\hat x_2\right]\right), \tag{11}$$

$$\hat x_2(t) = -\int_0^t e^{-it'\hat H}\hat x_2 e^{it'\hat H}\sum_{j=1}^{100}\frac{\lambda_j^2}{2}e^{i\Omega_j t'}\,dt'. \tag{12}$$

The non-unitary part $\mathcal{O}[\boldsymbol{m}]$ of NOSSE directly follows from Eqs. (11) and (5)

$$\mathcal{O}[\boldsymbol{m}] = \hat x_2\boldsymbol{m}\left(\left[\boldsymbol{m}^{-1}\hat x_2(t)\boldsymbol{m}\right]^\dagger - \left[\boldsymbol{m}^{-1}\hat x_2(t)\boldsymbol{m}\right]\right). \tag{13}$$



FIG. 1. Dynamics of the donor state population $P(t) = \mathrm{Tr}\{\hat\rho(t)[\mathbf{1}+\boldsymbol{\sigma}_z]\}/2$ starting from the Boltzmann distribution of the donor state at $T = 1000\,\mathrm{K}$. The bath is at the Boltzmann distribution with $T = 0\,\mathrm{K}$.

To simulate converged population dynamics (Fig. 1) the QME approach employed 240 basis functions, which correspond to 28920 independent matrix elements in $\hat\rho$. As few as $N = 14$ states in $\boldsymbol{m}$ provided a very good agreement between NOSSE and QME calculations, and with $N = 34$ the results are converged. This leads to only 3269 and 7599 unique matrix elements in NOSSE to propagate for $N = 14$ and $N = 34$, respectively. It is important to note that these reductions of the number of matrix elements will exponentially grow with the number of system DOF for larger systems. To choose $\boldsymbol{m}$ states we use not only the population criterion in the initial density eigen-decomposition but also the system and environment energy scales corresponding to the model dynamics[27].

Although there is a clear reduction of the number of propagated variables in the NOSSE formalism, it is important to confirm that this reduction leads to higher computational efficiency in terms of CPU time because there can be other factors (e.g., integration time step) that might reduce efficiency of NOSSE as compared to that of QME. Equation (11) is solved by the Runge–Kutta–Fehlberg (RKF45) algorithm as implemented in the ode45 Matlab function[28] on a twelve-core node Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2630 @ 2.30GHz with 64 GB of memory and dynamical allocation of number of cores. CPU times for simulations in Fig. 1 are given in Table I (non-Markovian) and show insignificant gain from using NOSSE. However, a closer examination reveals that evaluation of the non-Markovian correlator in Eq. (12) at each time step takes almost 98% of all CPU time, and it is the same for both QME and NOSSE formalisms. To perform a more adequate comparison we simulate the same propagation using the Markovian approximation [$t\to\infty$ in Eq. (12)] to avoid calculating the correlator at each time step. In this case, NOSSE is faster than QME by a factor of 2.2 (Table I).

Our second example shows how the NOSSE formalism combined with the TDVP leads to a set of equations of motion that conserve the energy of an *isolated* system. The TDVP allows one to derive approximate equations of motion when basis functions *and* their coefficients are time-dependent[14]. For the DM formalism the TDVP amounts to minimization of the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of an operator $\left\|\dot{\hat{\rho}} + i[\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}]\right\|$. In the NOSSE formalism we minimize $\left\|\dot{\boldsymbol{m}} + i\hat{H}\boldsymbol{m}\right\|$.

Consider an isolated system described by the Hamiltonian in Eq. (10). To apply the TDVP, we employ a linear combination of Gaussian products

$$\hat{\rho} = \sum_{j,k=1}^{N_g} |g_j\rangle\, B_{jk}\, \langle g_k|\,, \tag{14}$$

$$\langle x_1 x_2 | g_j\rangle = \exp\left[\sum_{\alpha=1}^{2}\left(-\frac{K_{j,\alpha}x_\alpha^2}{2} + \xi_{j,\alpha}x_\alpha\right)\right]. \tag{15}$$

The widths of Gaussian functions are fixed $K_{j,\alpha} = 1$, whereas $\boldsymbol{B} = \{B_{jk}\}$ and $\boldsymbol{\xi} = \{\xi_{j,\alpha}\}$ are the time-dependent quantities to be optimized via the TDVP[13]. Minimization of $\left\|\dot{\hat{\rho}} + i[\hat{H}, \hat{\rho}]\right\|$ results in the following equations of motion[29]

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{B}} = -\boldsymbol{S}^{-1}\left(i\boldsymbol{H} + \boldsymbol{\tau}\right)\boldsymbol{B} + \boldsymbol{B}\left(i\boldsymbol{H} - \boldsymbol{\tau}^\dagger\right)\boldsymbol{S}^{-1}, \tag{16}$$

$$\dot{\boldsymbol{\xi}} = \boldsymbol{C}^{-1}\boldsymbol{Y}, \tag{17}$$

where $S_{kl} = \langle g_k | g_l\rangle$, $\tau_{kl} = \langle g_k | \frac{\partial g_l}{\partial t}\rangle$, $H_{kl} = \langle g_k|\hat{H}|g_l\rangle$,

$$C_{kl}^{\alpha\beta} = \left\langle \frac{\partial g_k}{\partial \xi_{k,\alpha}}\left|\left[\hat{1} - \hat{P}_{N_g}\right]\right|\frac{\partial g_l}{\partial \xi_{l,\beta}}\right\rangle [\boldsymbol{BSB}]_{lk}, \tag{18}$$

$$[\boldsymbol{Y}]_k^\alpha = -i\sum_l \left\langle \frac{\partial g_k}{\partial \xi_{k,\alpha}}\left|\left[\hat{1} - \hat{P}_{N_g}\right]\hat{H}\hat{\rho}\right| g_l\right\rangle B_{lk}, \tag{19}$$

and $\hat{P}_{N_g} = \sum_{mn}|g_m\rangle\,[\boldsymbol{S}^{-1}]_{mn}\,\langle g_n|$. On the other hand, applying the TDVP to NOSSE recovers Eqs. (16) and (17) with new $\boldsymbol{C}$ and $\boldsymbol{Y}$:

$$C_{kl}^{\alpha\beta} = \left\langle \frac{\partial g_k}{\partial \xi_{k,\alpha}}\left|\left[\hat{1} - \hat{P}_{N_g}\right]\right|\frac{\partial g_l}{\partial \xi_{l,\beta}}\right\rangle B_{lk}, \tag{20}$$

$$[\boldsymbol{Y}]_k^\alpha = -i\sum_l \left\langle \frac{\partial g_k}{\partial \xi_{k,\alpha}}\left|\left[\hat{1} - \hat{P}_{N_g}\right]\hat{H}\right| g_l\right\rangle B_{lk}. \tag{21}$$

To expose the problem of energy conservation we used a different set of parameters and initial conditions than in our first example[27]. The total energy of the system as a function of time is plotted in Fig. 2. It is clear, that TDVP equations based on NOSSE definitions [Eqs. (20) and (21)] conserve the total energy of an isolated system, whereas the DM counterparts [Eqs. (18) and (19)] do not.

TABLE I. CPU time (min) for the first 100 femtoseconds of propagation. NOSSE values are for $N = 34$ states.

Correlator in Eq. (12)	QME	NOSSE
Non-Markovian	802	797
Markovian, $t \to \infty$	29	13



FIG. 2. Relative energy deviation $\left(\mathrm{Tr}\left\{\hat{H}\hat{\rho}(t)\right\} - E_0\right)/\omega_1$ for dynamics based on the QME [Eqs. (18) and (19)] and NOSSE [Eqs. (20) and (21)] formalisms. A basis set of 41 Gaussians is used in both cases.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We introduced a non-stochastic analog of the Schrödinger equation for open systems, NOSSE, that involves a set of wave functions. The equations of motion for this set are made to reproduce the QME evolution for the system density. Our formalism guarantees the positivity of the DM for any propagation time (as long as the solution exists) and it is applicable to Markovian and non-Markovian treatments of system-bath interaction. NOSSE is equivalent to QME only if the latter generates a positive mapping. In cases when QME does not guarantee the DM positivity, NOSSE enforces the positivity through a regularization procedure. Although the restoration of the DM positivity seems very attractive, one cannot guarantee that this feature will always improve the solution in a sense of the norm difference between approximate and exact solutions. Nevertheless, NOSSE is a general formalism that can operate with dissipators that do not suffer from loss of the DM positivity. From a numerical standpoint, our formalism is more computationally efficient since the number of dynamical variables is no longer quadratic with respect to size of the Hilbert space. The new approach is compatible with the TDVP, since it leads to total energy conservation for closed systems, and can be applied in investigating photochemical reactions induced by incoherent light.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

LJD thanks the European Union Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013) for financial support under grant agreement PIOF-GA-2012-332233. AFI acknowledges funding from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) through the Discovery Grants Program.

[1] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, eds., *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, New York, 2002).
[2] R. Dümcke and H. Spohn, Z. Physik B **34**, 419 (1979).
[3] A. van Wonderen and K. Lendi, J. Stat. Phys. **80**, 273 (1995).
[4] F. Benatti, R. Floreanini, and M. Piani, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 042110 (2003).
[5] G. Lindblad, Commun. Math. Phys. **48**, 119 (1976).
[6] R. Alicki, in *Quantum Dynamical Semigroups and Applications*, Lecture Notes in Physics, Vol. 286 (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1987) pp. 1–94.
[7] P. Pechukas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 1060 (1994).
[8] R. Alicki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3020 (1995).
[9] M. Beck, A. Jäckle, G. Worth, and H.-D. Meyer, Phys. Rep. **324**, 1 (2000).
[10] G. A. Worth, M. A. Robb, and I. Burghardt, Farad. Discuss. **127**, 307 (2004).
[11] M. Ben-Nun and T. J. Martinez, Adv. Chem. Phys. **121**, 439 (2002).
[12] K. Saita and D. V. Shalashilin, J. Chem. Phys. **137**, 22A506 (2012).
[13] A. F. Izmaylov, J. Chem. Phys. **138**, 104115 (2013).
[14] A. McLachlan, Mol. Phys. **8**, 39 (1964).
[15] A. Raab and H.-D. Meyer, Theor. Chem. Acc. **104**, 358 (2000).
[16] L. Disi and W. T. Strunz, Phys. Lett. A **235**, 569 (1997); W. T. Strunz, L. Diósi, and N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1801 (1999).
[17] J. T. Stockburger and H. Grabert, Chem. Phys. **268**, 249 (2001); Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 170407 (2002).
[18] J. Piilo, S. Maniscalco, K. Härkönen, and K.-A. Suominen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 180402 (2008).
[19] P. Rebentrost, R. Chakraborty, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, J. Chem. Phys. **131**, 184102 (2009).
[20] A. Yahalom and R. Englman, Physica A **371**, 368 (2006); J. Mol. Struct. Proceedings of the Symposium on the Jahn-Teller Effect, **838**, 27 (2007).
[21] C. P. Koch, T. Klüner, and R. Kosloff, J. Chem. Phys. **116**, 7983 (2002).
[22] C. P. Koch, T. Klüner, H.-J. Freund, and R. Kosloff, J. Chem. Phys. **119**, 1750 (2003).
[23] S. Mukamel, in *Principles of Nonlinear Optical Spectroscopy* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1995) p. 35.
[24] D. Kressner, C. Schröder, and D. S. Watkins, Numer. Algorithms **51**, 209 (2009).
[25] I. Peschel, Braz. J. Phys. **42**, 267 (2012).
[26] E. H. Moore, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **26**, 394395 (1920); R. Penrose, Math. Proc. Cambridge **51**, 406 (1955).
[27] L. Joubert-Doriol, I. G. Ryabinkin, and A. F. Izmaylov, "Non-stochastic matrix Schrödinger equation for open systems: Supplemental material," (2014).
[28] "Matlab, version 8.0.0.783 (r2012b)," The MathWorks Inc., Natick, Massachusetts (2012).
[29] I. Burghardt, H.-D. Meyer, and L. S. Cederbaum, J. Chem. Phys. **111**, 2927 (1999).